



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

1878, § 3224. And they are likewise deprived of equitable jurisdiction in all cases where there is a plain, adequate, and complete remedy at law. U. S. Rev. Stat., 1878, § 723.

The rule is based upon three separate principles. (1) There is a plain, adequate, and complete remedy at law, namely, to pay the illegal tax under protest, and sue the collecting officer as a trespasser. (2) The efficient collection of taxes, upon which governments are dependent for their continued existence, can be accomplished only by means of summary proceedings, and it is of the highest importance to the public that the instrumentalities used shall be as free as possible from interference by the courts. (3) Taxation is a legislative function, and the courts have no power to make or cause to be made a new tax in lieu of the illegal tax enjoined, so that full justice cannot be done where some tax is equitably due.

The state courts grant equitable relief against illegal taxes more freely than the Federal courts, though many follow the federal doctrine. *Staunton v. Mary Baldwin Seminary*, 99 Va. 653, 39 S. E. 596; *Youngblood v. Sexton*, 32 Mich. 406, 20 Am. Rep. 654; *Moline Water Power Co. v. Cox*, 252 Ill. 348, 96 N. E. 1044; *Odlin v. Woodruff*, 31 Fla. 160, 22 L. R. A. 699, and note; *Holland v. Mayor of Baltimore*, 11 Md. 186, 69 Am. Dec. 195, and note.

The stricter rule of the Federal courts would seem to be the sounder, both as a principle of equity procedure and also as a matter of public policy.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONES—DAMAGES FOR PROLONGATION OF MENTAL ANGUISH.—Plaintiff's husband sent a telegram to his wife stating that their child was safe. Owing to the defendant's negligence the message was delayed for five hours. *Held*, plaintiff could recover damages for the prolongation of her mental anguish, since the telegram was sufficient to put defendant on notice of her anxiety. *Middleton v. Western Union Tel. Co. (Ala.)*, 62 So. 744.

The weight of authority denies the recovery of damages from telegraph companies for mental anguish alone, even though the company is put on notice that such suffering may result from delay or non-delivery. *Chapman v. Western Union Tel. Co.*, 88 Ga. 763, 15 S. E. 901; *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Rogers*, 68 Miss. 748, 9 So. 823; *Connely v. Western Union Tel. Co.*, 100 Va. 51; *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Choteau*, 28 Okl. 664, 155 Pac. 879; *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Sklar*, 126 Fed. 295.

One view allows damages for the creation of mental suffering, but not for its prolongation. *So. Relle v. Western Union Tel. Co.*, 75 Tex. 26, 12 S. W. 534. Another line of authority, exemplified in the principal case, makes no distinction between the creation and the prolongation of mental anguish, and allows compensation in either case. *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Hollingsworth*, 83 Ark. 39, 102 S. W. 681, 11 L. R. A. (N. S.) 497; *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Robinson*, 97 Tenn. 638, 37 S. W. 545; *Dayvis v. Western Union Tel. Co.*, 139 N. C. 79, 51 S. E. 898.

As the distinction between the two situations is one of degree only, the latter seems to be the sounder view.